

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

COMMISSION FOR LAWYER DISCIPLINE,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	1:19-CV-754-RP
	§	
BRANDI K. STOKES,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

ORDER

Before the Court is the report and recommendation from United States Magistrate Judge Mark Lane concerning Defendant Brandi K. Stokes’s (“Stokes”) Motion for Leave to File under Seal, (Dkt. 13), Supplemental Pleading to Motion to Appoint Counsel, (Dkt. 17), and Second Supplemental Pleading to Motion to Appoint Counsel, (Dkt. 19), as well as Plaintiff Commission for Lawyer Discipline’s (“CLD”) Opposed Motion to Remand, (Dkt. 9). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Rule 1(d) of Appendix C of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Judge Lane issued his report and recommendation on January 9, 2020. (R&R, Dkt. 20). After that, Stokes filed a motion to disqualify Judge Lane, (Dkt. 21), an additional supplemental pleading to her motion to appoint counsel, (Dkt. 24), and a motion to dismiss, (Dkt. 25).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), a party may serve and file specific, written objections to a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation and, in doing so, secure de novo review by the district court. Stokes timely filed objections to the report and recommendation. (Objs., Dkt. 22).

Because Stokes timely objected to the report and recommendation, the Court reviews the report and recommendation de novo. Having done so, the Court overrules Stokes’s objections and adopts the report and recommendation as its own order.

In addition to his recommendations related to the motions listed above, Judge Lane recommends that this Court order Stokes “to disclose her full litigation history in any civil complaint, answer, and/or IFP affidavit she files” and warn her that “further frivolous filings or filings made for an improper purpose will likely lead to sanctions.” (R&R, Dkt. 20, at 5–6). Stokes objected to this portion of the report and recommendation. (*See* Objs., Dkt. 22, at 3–4). Her arguments are unavailing. The Court concurs with Judge Lane’s justification for these measures and finds them reasonable given the circumstances. (*See id.* at 6.).

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, (Dkt. 20), is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that CLD’s Opposed Motion to Remand, (Dkt. 9), is **GRANTED**. Consequently, because this Court does not have subject-matter jurisdiction over this matter, all of Stokes’s motions and other pleadings, (Dkt. 13, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25), are **MOOT**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is **REMANDED** to the 419th Civil District Court of Travis County, Texas.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Stokes shall disclose her full litigation history in any civil complaint, answer, and/or *in forma pauperis* affidavit she may file in the future.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that Stokes is **WARNED** that additional frivolous filings or filings made for an improper purpose will likely lead to sanctions.

SIGNED on January 27, 2020.



ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE